



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,501	01/16/2004	Donald Edward Benson	SVL920030128US1/A9845	6340
46159 7590 04/21/2011 SUGHRUE MION PLLC USPTO CUSTOMER NO WITH IBM/SVL 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
STACE, BRENT S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/21/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,501

Applicant(s)

BENSON ET AL.

Examiner

BRENT STACE

Art Unit

2161

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment dated February 8th, 2011. In the amendment dated February 8th, 2011, Claims 1-4 and 7-20 are pending, Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18-20 are amended, Claims 5 and 6 are canceled, and Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18-20 are independent Claims. This action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments dated February 8th, 2011 with respect to Claims 1-4 and 7-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. As to the applicant's arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including 9, 10, and 18-20) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting **"rolling back a request that is found invalid, and removing an entry for the invalid request from a library server transaction table,"** the examiner respectfully submits that this argument is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See below.
4. Any other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, February 8th, 2011, are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered rejected based on their respective rejections from at least a prior Office action (recited below).

Response to Amendment

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. Page 10, paragraph [034] recites "For example, information in value columns 212 may be used to reference or location objects that are stored in resource manager 106." It appears "For example, information in value columns 212 may be used to reference or ~~location~~ locate objects that are stored in resource manager 106" was intended.
 - b. Page 10, paragraph [036] recites "For example, a transaction may metadata associated with an item and corresponding content, such as objects, documents, or images, of an item." It appears that this fragment is missing some words.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

7. Since the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

drawings. For example, the drawings should be carefully checked to ensure that all reference numerals are described in the specification, that no one reference numeral describes two separate drawing elements, or that the specification contains no reference to numerals not in the drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous 35 USC § 101 rejections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-4 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,564,215 (Hsiao et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0069902 (Narang et al.).

For **Claim 1**, Hsiao teaches: "...said method comprising:

- receiving a request that affects an item; [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 27-33, update processing affects item in File_Version table]
- identifying a version of the item based on a first time; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- determining whether the request affects an object associated with the item; [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 48-61, "If the file was updated"]
- identifying a version of the object based on a second time when the request affects the object, [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66] wherein identifying the version of the object comprises retrieving a timestamp and an identifier for the object; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- ...rolling back the request; [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 45-51 with Hsiao, col. 10, lines 6-24]
- wherein the item comprises a library identifier to a managed resource which is external to a library; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- wherein the object comprises a binary object which is stored in at least one of a file system, a file server, an file archive, or a database separate from the library; [Hsiao, col. 3, lines 5-13] and

- wherein the rolling back the request includes removing an entry for the request from a library server transaction table” [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 30-33].

Hsiao discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: “A method of validating a request in connection with an interactive content database,

- “...completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object; and
- when the request is found invalid.”

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Narang, teaches: “A method of validating a request in connection with an interactive content database, [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]]

- “...completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object; [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]] and
- when the request is found invalid, [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to combine Narang with Hsiao because both inventions are directed towards file manipulation operations.

Narang’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hsiao’s invention because Narang and Hsiao are similar inventions. Hsiao discloses an update support in a database content management comprising updating files and metadata using a database. However, Hsiao does not expressly disclose validating requests or completing a request based on item version and object version. Narang

discloses a method of maintaining data consistency in a loose transaction model comprising comparing versions and timestamps to determine if a request should be carried out (is valid).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to take the validation techniques from Narang and install it into the invention of Hsiao, thereby offering the obvious advantage of ensuring meta-data and object data consistency in a loose transaction model of object and met-data updates (Narang, paragraph [0041]).

Claim 2 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein receiving the request comprises receiving a request for deleting the item" [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 48-64, updating file replaces old one, and thus old one is deleted, OR, Narang, paragraphs [0017] and [0019]].

Claim 3 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein identifying the version of the item comprises retrieving a timestamp for the item" [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].

Claim 4 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein identifying the version of the item comprises retrieving the timestamp and an identifier for the item" [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076] with Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66].

Claim 7 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object comprises:

- determining whether the version of the item matches the version of the object; [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]] and
- completing the request when the versions of the item and object match" [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].

Claim 8 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The method of claim 1, wherein completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object comprises

- determining whether the version of the item is older than the version of the object; [Narang, paragraphs [0132]-[0137]] and
- completing the request when the version of the item is older than the version of the object" [Narang, paragraphs [0132]-[0137] with [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].

Claim 9 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 1, in addition to an apparatus and some means for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 9 also includes "and the item is stored in at least one of a memory and a storage device" [met by Hsiao, col. 4, lines 12-20 with Hsiao, cols. 5-6, lines 50-14].

Claims 10-13, 16, and 17 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 1-4, 7, and 8, respectfully, in addition to an application program stored on a computer readable medium and some program code for performing the method steps of Claims 1-4, 7, and 8, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 10-

13, 16, and 17 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 1-4, 7, and 8, respectfully.

Claim 14 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The medium of claim 10, further comprising program code for retrieving a timestamp for the object" [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 15-38 with Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076] with Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66].

Claim 15 can be mapped to Hsiao (as modified by Narang) as follows: "The medium of claim 14, further comprising program code for retrieving the timestamp and an identifier for the object" [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 15-38 with Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076] with Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66].

For **Claim 18**, Hsiao teaches: "... wherein the item includes an associated object, [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66, entry item in table is associated with a file object] said method comprising:

- identifying a first age of the item affected by the request; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- retrieving information indicating a second age of at least one associated object; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- tracking and recording transaction attributes of the first age of the item and the second age of the at least one associated object; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- ...rolling back the request, [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 45-51 with Hsiao, col. 10, lines 6-24]

- wherein the item comprises a library identifier to a managed resource which is external to a library, [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- wherein the object comprises a binary object which is stored in at least one of a file system, a file server, an file archive, or a database separate from the library, [Hsiao, col. 3, lines 5-13] and
- wherein the rolling back the request includes removing an entry for the request from a library server transaction table" [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 30-33].

Hsiao discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "A method of processing requests that delete an item in connection with an interactive content database,

- ... receiving a request that deletes an item;
- ... selectively deleting the item and the at least one associated object based on whether the first age of the item is greater than or equal to the second age of the at least one associated object; and
- when the request is found invalid."

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Narang, teaches: "A method of processing requests that delete an item in connection with an interactive content database, [Narang, paragraphs [0017] and [0019]]

- ... receiving a request that deletes an item; [Narang, paragraphs [0017] and [0019]]
- ... selectively deleting the item and the at least one associated object based on whether the first age of the item is greater than or equal to the second age of the

at least one associated object; [Narang, paragraphs [0017] and [0019] with [0132]-[0137] with [0023] and [0075]-[0076]] and

- when the request is found invalid" [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to combine Narang with Hsiao because both inventions are directed towards file manipulation operations.

Narang's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hsiao's invention because Narang and Hsiao are similar inventions. Hsiao discloses an update support in a database content management comprising updating files and metadata using a database. However, Hsiao does not expressly disclose validating requests or completing a request based on item version and object version. Narang discloses a method of maintaining data consistency in a loose transaction model comprising comparing versions and timestamps to determine if a request should be carried out (is valid).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to take the validation techniques from Narang and install it into the invention of Hsiao, thereby offering the obvious advantage of ensuring meta-data and object data consistency in a loose transaction model of object and met-data updates (Narang, paragraph [0041]).

Claim 19 encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 18, in addition to an apparatus and some means for performing the method steps

of Claim 18. Therefore, Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 18. Claim 19 also includes "and the item is stored in at least one of a memory and a storage device" [met by Hsiao, col. 4, lines 12-20 with Hsiao, cols. 5-6, lines 50-14].

For **Claim 20**, Hsiao teaches: "...said method comprising:

- providing a library server database including accessible items therein; [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 27-33 with Hsiao, col. 5, lines 16-18]
- receiving a request that affects an item; [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 27-33, update processing affects item in File_Version table]
- identifying a version of the item based on a first time; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- determining whether the request affects an object associated with the item; [Hsiao, col. 8, lines 48-61, "If the file was updated"]
- identifying a version of the object based on a second time when the request affects the object; [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- ...rolling back the request, [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 45-51 with Hsiao, col. 10, lines 6-24]
- wherein the item comprises a library identifier to a managed resource which is external to a library, [Hsiao, col. 6, lines 50-66]
- wherein the object comprises a binary object which is stored in at least one of a file system, a file server, an file archive, or a database separate from the library, [Hsiao, col. 3, lines 5-13] and

- wherein the rolling back the request includes removing an entry for the request from a library server transaction table” [Hsiao, col. 9, lines 30-33].

Hsiao discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: “A method of validating a request,

- ...completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object; and
- when the request is found invalid.”

With respect to Claim 20, an analogous art, Narang, teaches: “A method of validating a request, [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]]

- ...completing the request based on the version of the item and the version of the object; [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]] and
- when the request is found invalid” [Narang, paragraphs [0023] and [0075]-[0076]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to combine Narang with Hsiao because both inventions are directed towards file manipulation operations.

Narang’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Hsiao’s invention because Narang and Hsiao are similar inventions. Hsiao discloses an update support in a database content management comprising updating files and metadata using a database. However, Hsiao does not expressly disclose validating requests or completing a request based on item version and object version. Narang discloses a method of maintaining data consistency in a loose transaction model

comprising comparing versions and timestamps to determine if a request should be carried out (is valid).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Narang and Hsiao before him/her to take the validation techniques from Narang and install it into the invention of Hsiao, thereby offering the obvious advantage of ensuring meta-data and object data consistency in a loose transaction model of object and met-data updates (Narang, paragraph [0041]).

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

13. Any prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is advised that, although not used in the rejections above, prior art cited on any PTO-892 form and not relied upon is considered materially relevant to the applicant's claimed invention and/or portions of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10am-6:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BRENT STACE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161